

**9108. Misbranding of Antilaiteuse. U. S. \* \* \* v. 30 Packages, 8 Packages, 3 Bottles, and 48 Bottles of \* \* \* Antilaiteuse. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. Nos. 14087, 14088, 14107, 14108. Inv. Nos. 24551, 24552, 24527, 24528, 24533. S. Nos. E-2996, E-2998, E-3007, E-3008, E-3009.)

On December 22 and December 24, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Maine, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying the seizure and condemnation of 30 packages, 8 packages, 3 bottles, and 48 bottles of Antilaiteuse, consigned by Dr. N. A. Sirois, Manchester, N. H., remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Springvale, Biddeford, Lewiston, and Livermore Falls, Me., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about November 19, November 11, November 30, and September 13, 1920, and transported from the State of New Hampshire into the State of Maine, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of Epsom salts, about 85 per cent, and ground juniper berries.

It was alleged in substance in the libels that the article was misbranded for the reason that the packages containing it bore certain statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of such articles, as follows, "Potion Antilaiteuse \* \* \* Remedy For Men and Women To Cleanse and Relieve the body and blood of all poisons and impurities causing all kinds of disorders. \* \* \* Weening, removal of milk from limbs and blood, to prevent miscarriage, diseases of the womb, change of life, dropsy, kidney disease, rheumatism, eclampsia, excessive stoutness, paralysis, piles \* \* \* and poor digestion. \* \* \* It acts by cleaning the kidneys, \* \* \* and the blood," which said statements were false and fraudulent in that the article contained no ingredient or ingredients capable of producing the curative or therapeutic effects claimed for it in said statements.

On January 22, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**9109. Adulteration and misbranding of catsup. U. S. \* \* \* v. 24 Cases \* \* \* of Royal Kitchen Brand Tomato Catsup. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 14142. I. S. No. 7842-t. S. No. E-3039.)

On January 5, 1921, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 24 cases, more or less, of Royal Kitchen Brand tomato catsup, consigned by Ross Rizzo, Albion, N. Y., remaining in the original unbroken packages at Coatesville, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about November 13, 1920, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Bottle) "Royal Kitchen Brand Tomato Catsup \* \* \* Made From Selected Tomatoes \* \* \* Contents 10 Oz. \* \* \* Packed By Thomas Page, Albion, N. Y., U. S. A."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the retail packages in which the product was inclosed contained labels which bore the following